1 2

Hon. Kymberly K. Evanson

3

45

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

10

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C25-1228-KKE

NOTICE OF MOTION AND DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM DEADLINES

(Note on motion calendar for: September 24, 2025)

Defendants Linda McMahon, in her official capacity, and the United States Department of Education (collectively, "the Department"), through their attorneys, Teal Luthy Miller, Acting United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington and Brian C. Kipnis, Assistant United States Attorney, hereby move this Court, pursuant to pursuant to Rule 6(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and LCR 7(d)(2) of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, and based on good cause, for an order (1) extending their deadline to file their reply in response to the States' opposition to their motion to dismiss to October 14, 2025; and (2) moving the hearing on the Department's motion to dismiss from October 7 to an appropriate date as determined by the Court.

This motion is made and based on the pleadings and papers filed herein and the Declaration of Brian C. Kipnis.

1	DATED this 10th day of September 2025.	
2		Respectfully submitted,
3		TEAL LUTHY MILLER
4		Acting United States Attorney
5		<u>/s/ Brian C. Kipnis</u> BRIAN C. KIPNIS
6		Assistant United States Attorney Office of the United States Attorney
7		5220 United States Courthouse 700 Stewart Street
8		Seattle, Washington 98101-1271 Phone: 206-553-7970
9		Email: brian.kipnis@usdoj.gov
10		Attorneys for Defendants
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

27

28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

INTRODUCTION

The Department seeks an order pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) extending by approximately two weeks its time to file a reply to the opposition of Plaintiffs, the States of Washington, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, New Mexico, New York, Nevada, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the People of the State of Michigan (collectively, "the States"), to the Department's pending motion to dismiss. ¹ The Department also requests that the Court move the currently set hearing date on its motion to dismiss.

This request is made necessary because the attorney of record who represents the Department in this lawsuit will be departing the United States on Monday, September 15, for a three-week overseas vacation that was planned months in advance and for which substantial personal funds have already been committed. The Department's attorney does not return to work until Monday, October 6.

This request was not made necessary by any dilatory conduct of the Department's counsel. Indeed, counsel for the Department has worked assiduously on the defense of this lawsuit since it was assigned to him on or about July 5, 2025, particularly in preparing the Department's opposition to the States' motion for a preliminary injunction and in preparing and filing the Department's motion to dismiss. The Department is unaware of any prejudice to the States by the granting of this motion. Assuming for purposes of argument that the States are lawfully representing the interests of all discontinued grantees of SBMH and MHSP grants within their territories in this lawsuit, the discontinuation decisions that the States are challenging do not take effect until 2026.

Before filing this motion, the Department's counsel contacted the States' counsel in an effort to reach an agreement that would obviate the need for this motion. Unfortunately, the parties were not able to reach an agreement, necessitating the filing of this motion.

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

¹ The Department has no objection to a commensurate extension of time for the States' opposition memorandum.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The States bring this action to invalidate the Department's discontinuation of certain grant agreements entered into with school districts, regional education agencies, state education departments, and universities located within their borders (collectively, the "Grantees") pursuant to the Department's Mental Health Service Professional Developmental Grant Program (MHSP) and its School-Based Mental Health Services Grant Program (SBMH). Notice of the discontinuation of the grants in question were provided to the grantees on or about April 29, 2025. Dkt. # 1, ¶ 6. The discontinuances do not take effect until January 1, 2026. *See* Dkt. # 1, ¶ 80.

The States filed their complaint in this action on June 30, 2025. Dkt. # 1. They moved for a preliminary injunction on July 8, 2025. Dkt. # 49. The Department filed a timely opposition to the States' motion on August 6, 2025. Dkt. # 147. On September 5, 2025, the Court heard oral argument on the States' motion for a preliminary injunction. Also, on that same date, the Department filed its timely motion to dismiss the complaint. Dkt. # 161.

Aware that his upcoming vacation plans would conflict with the briefing schedule prescribed by the local rules of this Court with respect to the Department's motion to dismiss, the Department's counsel contacted the States' counsel on September 5 to discuss the possibility of a negotiated extension of the briefing schedule. Declaration of Kipnis, ¶¶ 7-8. While those discussions were in progress, the Court, on September 9, issued a *sua sponte* order renoting the States' preliminary injunction motion and the Department's motion to dismiss to October 7, establishing a briefing schedule for the Department's motion to dismiss, including a deadline for the filing of the Department's reply of September 30, and setting a hearing on the Department's motion to dismiss for October 7, 2025. Dkt. # 162.

The Department's counsel will be overseas on September 30, 2025. Decl. of Kipnis, ¶ 10. The date of the hearing occurs on his second day back at work after three weeks without access to his DOJ devices. *Id*.

Discussions between the parties continued after the Court issued its September 9 order. Id. at ¶ 12. Ultimately, the parties were unable to reach agreement on a negotiated extension of time to propose to the Court, making this motion necessary. Id.

NOTICE OF MOTION AND DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM DEADLINES - 4 (Case No. C25-1228KKE) UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 5220 UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 700 Stewart Street Seattle, Washington 98101-1271 (206)-553-7970 This request is necessary because of longstanding vacation plans that make it impossible for

7 8

5

6

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27 28

I. FOR GOOD CAUSE THE COURT MAY EXTEND THE TIME TO ACT Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) provides:

- (1) In General. When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time:
- (A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires . . .

In this Circuit, requests for extensions of time that are determined under the good cause standard should "normally ... be granted in the absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking relief or prejudice to the adverse party." Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010).

The Department's counsel is not acting in bad faith. This request is made necessary to accommodate longstanding vacation plans that preexisted the filing of this lawsuit. Nor is the need to extend the deadlines in this case occasioned by any dilatory conduct on the part of the Department's counsel. On the Department's behalf, its counsel filed a timely opposition to the States' motion for a preliminary injunction and a timely motion to dismiss the States' complaint.

Although acting in good faith, the Department's counsel will be unable to file the Department's reply to the States' opposition to its motion to dismiss within the time prescribed by the Court's September 9 order because he will be overseas on vacation and without access to his government-issued computer. Also, counsel for the Department does not believe he will be able to responsibly prepare for an oral argument on his motion to dismiss that occurs on the second day of his return from vacation.

The Department is unaware of any prejudice that the States will incur as the result of the granting of this request for a two-week extension of the deadlines set by the Court in its September 9

order. While the States would obviously prefer to have the Court make rulings in this case sooner 1 2 rather than later, such a preference does not constitute tangible prejudice. As the States have alleged in their complaint, the discontinued grantees whose interests the States purport to represent in this 3 action may continue to fully rely on their grant funding through December 31, 2025. 4 Thus, the requested extension of time is proper under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 6(b)(1)(A), and the Department respectfully requests that its motion be granted. 6 **CONCLUSION** 7 For the foregoing reasons, the Department respectfully requests that the Court grant the 8 Department's motion for good cause and extend the time within which the Department may reply to 9 the States' opposition to their motion to dismiss to October 14, 2025, and reset oral argument on the 10 Department's motion to a date that the Court deems appropriate after October 14, 2025. 11 12 **CERTIFICATION** I certify that this memorandum contains 1,471 words, in compliance with the local civil 13 14 rules. 15 DATED this 10th day of September 2025. 16 Respectfully submitted, 17 18 TEAL LUTHY MILLER Acting United States Attorney 19

> /s/ Brian C. Kipnis BRIAN C. KIPNIS **Assistant United States Attorney** Office of the United States Attorney 5220 United States Courthouse 700 Stewart Street Seattle, Washington 98101-1271 Phone: 206 553 7970 E-mail: brian.kipnis@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

26

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

NOTICE OF MOTION AND DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR **RELIEF FROM DEADLINES - 6** (Case No. C25-1228KKE)